UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Western	DISTRICT OF	<u>Pennsylvania</u>
---------	-------------	---------------------

ACCU-SPEC ELECTRONIC SERVICES, INC

EXHIBIT AND WITNESS LIST

V.
CENTRAL TRANSPORT INTERNATIONAL,
INC., et al.,

Case Number: 03-394 ERIE

DDEG	DING II		vc., et ai	••	DI AINTIEE'S ATTODNEY	DEFENDANTIA ATTOMISM	
PRESIDING JUDGE Sean J. McLaughlin			Laughlin		PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY Patrick Delaney	DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY Leffery Cohon (de #1) Lohn Know (de #2)	
TRIAL DATE (S)			Laugiiiii		COURT REPORTER	Jeffery Cohen (dft #1) John Knox (dft #2) COURTROOM DEPUTY	
10/17/05 thru			5 thru		Ronald Bench	Nicole Kierzek	
PLF. NO.	DEF. NO.	DATE OFFERED	MARKED	ADMITTED	DESCRIPTION OF EXHIBITS* AND WITNESSES		
1		10/17/05	1	x	Letter		
1		10/17/05	2 - 18	х	Photos of Machine/Crate	Photos of Machine/Crate	
1		10/17/05	19	х	Document- Peter Dunns Report	Document- Peter Dunns Report	
1		10/17/05	20	х	2 page letter dated 2/21/03 from Accu-spe	c discussing damages	
1		10/17/05	21	х	claim form from central transport		
1		10/17/05	22	х	response from Central transport regarding claim form		
1		10/17/05	23	х	Package of documents		
1		10/18/05	CT 5	х	document		
	1	10/18/05	CT 2	х	document- claim form		
	1	10/18/05	CT 9	х	document- inspection report		
	1	10/18/05	CT 8	х	document- 1st claim/ cargo claim filed with central transcript		
	1	10/18/05	CT 10	Х	document- 2 nd claim/		
	2	10/18/05	LP2	X	Invoice from Rogs Inc.		
1		10/18/05	25	х	document		
	2	10/18/05	LP 1	х	document		
1		10/18/05	24	х	document		
	2	10/18/05	CT13	х	identical copy of CT1 - bill of lading		
	1	10/18/05	CT 4	х	document		
	1	10/18/05	CT 3	х	document		
	1	10/18/05	CT 7	х	document		
	1	10/18/05	CT 16	х	page 200		
	2	10/18/05	LP 1	х	letter		

^{*} Include a notation as to the location of any exhibit not held with the case file or not available because of size.

Case 1:03-cv-00394-SJM Document 57 Filed 10/20/2005 Page 2 of 5

SAO 187A (Rev. 7/87)

EXHIBIT AND WITNESS LIST – CONTINUATION

Accu-Spec		V	s. Central Transport, et al.,	CASE NO. CA 03-394 ERIE		
PLF. NO.			MARKED	ADMITTED	DESCRIPTION OF EX	CHIBITS AND WITNESSES
	2	10/19/05	CT 6	x	LP QUOTE	
					WITNESSES	
X		10/17/05			ERNIE CARLSON	
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS DFT #2	
					REDIRECT	
X		10/18/05			JAMES MULLEN	:
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS DFT #2	
					REDIRECT	
	1	10/18/05			GEORGE HORETSKY	
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #2	
					CROSS PLA	
					REDIRECT	
X		10/18/05	JOE FISHER			
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS DFT #2	
	1	10/18/05			JEFFREY CACKOWSKI	
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #2	
					CROSS PLA	

	_	
Page	of	Pages
ago	O1	I agos

Case 1:03-cv-00394-SJM Document 57 Filed 10/20/2005 Page 3 of 5

SAO 187A (Rev. 7/87)

EXHIBIT AND WITNESS LIST – CONTINUATION

Accu-Spec		V	c. Central Transport et al.,	CASE NO. 03-394 ERIE		
PLF. NO.	DEF. NO.	DATE OFFERED	MARKED	ADMITTED		
	1	10/19/05			DALE MEABON	
					DIRECT	
		-			CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS PLA	
	2	10/19/05			CHRIS FANZINI	
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS PLA	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS PLA	
	2	10/19/05			JAMES BERLIN	
					DIRECT	
					CROSS DFT #1	
					CROSS PLA	

Page _____ of ____ Pages

INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY

1.	Did Defendant Central Transport receive the cargo in good condition?
	YES_X_
	NO
	u answer "yes" to Question #1, proceed to Question #2. If you answer "no" to Question #1, stop eturn to the courtroom.)
2.	Was the cargo improperly packaged by Accu-Spec?
	YES
	NO_X_
	u answer "yes" to Question #2, proceed to Question #3. If you answer "no" to Question #2, ed to Question #4.)
3.	If the cargo was improperly packaged, was the lack of proper packaging the sole factor
	in causing the damage to the cargo?
	YES
	NO
	ou answer "yes" to Question #3, stop and return to the courtroom. If you answer "no" to ion #3, proceed to Question #4.)
4.	Was it reasonable for the Plaintiff, after discovering that the cargo was damaged, to have the
	damage inspected by a representative of the manufacturer from England?
	YES
	NO_X
Proce	ed to the next question.

5. Was it reasonable for the Plaintiff, after discovering that the cargo was damaged, to have the cargo shipped to England to be repaired?

YES_X

NO

Proceed to the next question.

6. What amount, if any, is Plaintiff entitled to recover from Central Transport?

<u>\$ 21,000</u>

7. What amount, if any, is Plaintiff entitled to recover from Logistics Plus?

\$ 21,000

Forenerson

m Markbr (28)

audry (arndr (1)

Robers Jom. fr

Simolar Starffor

10-20-05

Date

10-20-05

Suan Storten